UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/553,398	08/31/2006	Giuseppe Lo Biundo	Q89568	8985
23373 SUGHRUE MI	7590 03/24/201 ON, PLLC	EXAMINER		
2100 PENNSY	LVANIA AVENUE, N	WEINSTEIN, LEONARD J		
SUITE 800 WASHINGTO	N, DC 20037	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3746	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/24/2011	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

sughrue@sughrue.com PPROCESSING@SUGHRUE.COM USPTO@SUGHRUE.COM

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/553,398	LO BIUNDO ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
LEONARD J. WEINSTEIN	3746	

	LEONARD J. WEINSTEIN	3746	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>16 March 2011</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AP		_	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appelor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Coperiods:	the same day as filing a Notice of replies: (1) an amendment, affidavieal (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, v with 37 CFR 41.31; o	which places the r (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION: See MPEP 706.07()	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	on.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ension and the corresponding amount chortened statutory period for reply origithan three months after the mailing date.	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a converse of the present additional claims without canceling a converse of the present additional claims without canceling a converse of the present additional claims without canceling a converse of the present additional claims without canceling a converse of the present additional claims without canceling a converse of the present additional claims without canceling a converse of the present additional claims without canceling a converse of the present additional claims without canceling a converse of the present additional claims without canceling a converse of the present additional claims without canceling a converse of the present additional claims without canceling a converse of the present additional claims without canceling a converse of the present additional claims without canceling a converse of the present additional claims without canceling a converse of the present additional claims without canceling a converse of the present additional claims without canceling a converse of the present additional claims without canceling and the present additional claims are converted and the present additional claims ar	nsideration and/or search (see NO w); ter form for appeal by materially re- corresponding number of finally reje	TE below); ducing or simplifying t	
 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [21. See attached Notice of Non-Co lowable if submitted in a separate, Will not be entered, or b) will	timely filed amendme	nt canceling the
how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1,2,4-6 and 8-11. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	исеа вею от аррепаеа.		
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. ☐ The request for reconsideration has been considered but		,	
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. ☑ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Devon C Kramer/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3746	/Leonard J Weinstein/ Examiner, Art Unit 3746		

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The addition of claim 10 to claim 1, provides a limitation that was not previously disclosed with respect to claims 2, 4-6, and 9 and would require further consideration and/or search.

Continuation of 13. Other: With respect to the rejection of the limitations including claims 8 and 11 as previously presented in the Amendment of October 8, 2010 and now incorporated into claim 8, the applicant argues that the combination including Whitefield US 5,282,446 ("Whitefield") in view of Schneider US 6,345,600 (Schneider) as evidenced by Garza US 5,535,643 ("Garza"), further in view of Sato US 5,941,203, still further in view of Hayam et al. US 6,602,557 does not render the instant invention obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). The applicant argues that it is improper to construe the vanes 58 of the secondary pump defined by the vanes 58 and gear 48 of Hayman as being related to the oil and vacuum pump of Scheider. The applicant also argues that if construed as a pump the vanes 58 would be adjacent to an oil pump and not an arrangement where a gear was between an vacuum pump and an oil pump.

The examiner notes several things about Whitefield, Schneider, and Hayman. Whitefield teaches two embodiments, one including a vane pump and one without. To accommodate the vane pump Whitefield moves an input drive member outwards and installs a vacuum pump in an isolated housing in between the input drive member and the oil pump. Thus Whitefield actually provides a teaching of rearranging parts, one of which significantly is a drive input member, to accommodate another pump.

There are both significant similarities and differences with Whitefield, Schneider, and Hayman. In Whitefield there are three pumps including the centrifugal impeller on the left side of the oil pump. The impeller of Whitefield is disposed on the end of the combined shaft and adjacent to an oil pump in a very similar manner to the rotating vane pump constructively formed by the vanes 58, and a first oil pump of Hayman. With the impeller, Whitefield provides three fluid conveying pumps on one combined drive shaft in the order of an impeller, oil pump, vacuum pump, and input drive. Hayman provides four pumps and a rotating input member consisting in order of an impeller, a gear (input), first oil pump, second oil pump, and vacuum pump. By the applicant's own interpretation the vanes and gear are a pump, and not a gear in between two pumps. Under this construction Hayman teaches an impeller, first oil pump, second oil pump, and vacuum pump. The difference than in the arrangements of Whitefield and Hayman, is that there is a shaft and an entirely separate pump between the first oil pump and the vacuum pump in Hayman. Schneider teaches a different arrangement of a drive input, oil pump, and then a vacuum pump. This is similar to Whitefield in that the oil and vacuum pumps are adjacent but also similar to Hayman in that a drive input is adjacent to an oil pump.

It will be noted however that Hayman and Schneider teach an input member that is at the opposite end of a drive shaft from a vacuum pump, whereas Whitefield includes a drive member that is adjacent to a vacuum pump. Together the references teach that the drive input for a shaft, an oil pump, and a vacuum pump can be arranged in different configurations on a drive shaft. Hayman teaches an input next to an oil pump, Whitefield teaches an input that can be moved to accommodate another pump next to a vacuum pump. Both Whitefield and Hayman teach what could be interpreted as an impeller on the same side of an oil pump. The degree of variation and order, specifically with respect to where an input is located, would lead one of ordinary skill in the art to conclude (1) that it was obvious to (2) and the prior art suggested that another iteration of a combination of similar pumps on a single shaft would include a gear or a drive input between two of the pumps. This is especially true and applicable to Whitefield, because the reference actually teaches rearranging where a drive input is located to accommodate a pump.